

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 203

TE 001 882

AUTHOR Standley, Fred L.
TITLE Beyond Formalism: Literary Criticism Now and in the Immediate Future.
PUB DATE Nov 69
NOTE 20p.; Speech given at the Annual Convention of the National Council of Teachers of English, Washington, D.C., November, 1969

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.10
DESCRIPTORS Biographies, Existentialism, *Formal Criticism, Impressionistic Criticism, Linguistics, Literary Analysis, *Literary Criticism, Moral Criticism, *Mythic Criticism, *Philosophy, Religion, Sociocultural Patterns, Textual Criticism

ABSTRACT

Formalism, an amalgamation of literary critical methods originating in the 1920's, which emphasize close textual analysis of the literary work itself, is declining as the predominant critical approach due to its self-imposed limitations. New perspectives, attempting to counter the fragmentation of formalism and demonstrating an awareness of the artist's search for human vision, can be divided into two categories of critical perspectives--a minor group consisting of impressionistic, journalistic, and biographical criticism; and a major group: mythological and archetypal (grounded in anthropology and depth psychology); linguistic and stylistic (literature as language, medium of communication); socio-cultural (e.g., ethnic and revolutionary literature); religious and theological (e.g., artist as prophet); and philosophical (especially existentialism and phenomenology). These methodologies represent a variety of critical approaches, each tentatively endorsing a different emphasis, none in possession of an exclusive or permanent critical truth, all demanding exploration by teachers and students alike. (MF)

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

Fred L. Standley
Department of English
Florida State University

BEYOND FORMALISM: LITERARY CRITICISM NOW AND IN THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE

Epigraph

"Our American professors like their literature
clear, cold, pure and very dead."

Sinclair Lewis

Introduction

To be so audacious as to attempt to say something significant about literary criticism in twenty-five minutes is somewhat analogous to the ancient Greeks doing battle with the Hydra. For the questions and problems inherent to the formulation and exercise of criticism are multiple; and as soon as one question or problem is posed and assumedly resolved, two others of seemingly equal import rear their heads demanding to be grappled with. Nevertheless, with Herculean desire and existential trepidation, I approach the subject.

The position and status of literary criticism within the field of English studies today is difficult to assess, and the disturbing fact is that the subject receives quite contradictory treatment at the highest echelons of professional organizations. I would refer specifically to the recently published and assuredly significant book by Professor Michael T. Shugrue entitled English in a Decade of Change. Mr. Shugrue has performed a necessary task in summarizing and analyzing the innovations, trends and controversies in the teaching and learning of English at all grade levels. His preface states that five questions determined the contents of the book:

- (1) What is the nature of English?

ED040203

TE001882

- (2) What is actually being taught in English classrooms around the United States?
- (3) What developments in literary theory, linguistics, methodology and technology are likely to affect the teaching of English in the 1970's?
- (4) Who is teaching English in the schools and colleges of the United States?
- (5) Will the conversations which have begun among teachers of English from the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom continue to be as fruitful as they have proved in the first few years of dialogue?¹

In so far as the theory, history and practice of literary criticism is concerned the irony of this book consists in its nearly complete neglect to consider criticism as an integral facet of English studies. To be sure the name and work of one distinguished contemporary critic is given a paragraph's treatment (p. 31), but even then one searches in vain for some mention of criticism as an indisputable aspect of the study of English. Yet this book promises to "outline new responsibilities for the teacher of English, especially at the college level, and to suggest promising techniques and classroom patterns for the English classroom of the 1970's." This neglect is, in my opinion, a grievous error.²

The omission is even more serious when such judgments as the ensuing are scrutinized:

- (a) "Both the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries have been called 'the age of criticism': surely the twentieth century deserves this title with a vengeance. Not only has a veritable spate of criticism descended upon us, but criticism has achieved a new self-consciousness, a much greater public status, and has developed in recent decades new methods and evaluations."³
- (b) "Perhaps no area in the English curriculum has undergone more radical changes since the Second World War than has literary criticism; indeed, only since that time has it become an area. Earlier, literary criticism would hardly have been thought worthy of separate treatment . . ."⁴

Presuppositions

In treating the subject of this paper there are certain presuppositions which largely control what I have to say; therefore, they should be specified clearly in the beginning.

(1) The mode of human experience designated as aesthetic is of paramount significance in our existence, along with the other modes of experience traditionally afforded consideration (e.g. in philosophy), viz. the moral, cognitive, emotive, and religious as a minimum. Or, as Iredell Jenkins says in Art and the Human Enterprise:

Aesthetic activity is a natural and spontaneous phase of man's ordinary response to the environment; that it is a necessary partner in the process of adjustment; that art exists for life's sake, and that life could not exist without art.⁵

(2) By art or an aesthetic object I mean "the creation of meaningful and pleasurable patterns of experience, or the manipulation of human experience into meaningful and pleasurable patterns."⁶ However, I admit that there is an essential mystery as to what transpires in the "creative" process whereby artist, world, and society coalesce to "make" a work of art.

(3) The work of art exists in function and purpose for significance. As Denis de Rougement has pointed out: "Distinct from all other products of human action the work of art is an object of which the raison d'etre necessary and sufficient, is to Signify, organically, and by means of its own structure."⁷

(4) The work of literature as a form of artistic expression is a work of art, an aesthetic object or artifact, capable of being identified and defined, though not easily.

(5) Such a work of literature is "a structure of verbal signs," a product of man thinking and writing; and it is ultimately analyzable both in terms of its organic form or structure and its meaning; that is, the work of literature is subject to rational discussion.

(6) The work of literature as a work of art fashioned by man in a historical and chronological setting is both a reflector of the cultural milieu out of which it emerges and a contributor to the evolution of that milieu.

(7) The work of literature engages man's attention and elicits some kind of response; therefore, "criticism is a natural activity for the literate man It is a normal prolongation of intelligent reading to read a work of literature is to engage in an enterprise: it is when we step back to reflect on that enterprise that criticism really begins there arises the need to question, to analyze, to set down in order, to compare. And this activity we call criticism."⁸

(8) Literary criticism is derivative from the process of engagement with the aesthetic object and is the commentation on and the exposition of the work; it always professes an end, a purpose, viz. the elucidation of the work of literature. (I shall bracket the question which has plagued men of letters for centuries, i.e. to what extent the critical act is also a creative and/or imaginative act.)

(9) In commenting on and elucidating the work of literature and discussing it as a structure of verbal signs, literary criticism tends to enter a territory shared by theology, philosophy, ethics, sociology, politics, etc.

It is nevertheless impossible for criticism to keep out of these disputed areas . . . the full elucidation of a literary work inevitably goes beyond the discussion of a verbal structure . . . Criticism is constituted as a distinct field by having its centre in literature and its circumference on some not strictly definable line where literature ceases to be visible . . . Criticism is centripetal; however widely it may range, it must return to literature.⁹

(10) Literary criticism, as I use the term, refers primarily to that criticism as formulated and practiced in the colleges and universities of the United States, though not exclusively here. Another way of phrasing the same idea is that every teacher of literature is also a literary critic.

Having the rudimentary outline of a theory of aesthetics, literature and criticism, it would, perhaps, be erroneous to infer that the contemporary practice of criticism is thereby made easier. On the contrary, the endeavor is still fraught with innumerable obstacles and problems which have been amply spelled out in several essays. Notable among these for focusing succinctly on the main questions are: I.A. Richards, Practical Criticism (1929); R.P. Blackmur, "A Critic's Job of Work" (1946) and "A Burden for Critics" (1948); Leslie Fiedler, "Toward an Amateur Criticism" (1950); Allen Tate, "Is Literary Criticism Possible?" (1955); Yvor Winters, "Problems for the Modern Critic of Literature" (1956); and Philip Rahv, "Criticism and the Imagination of Alternatives" (1958).¹⁰

In spite of these obstacles and problems, however, the critical enterprise is endemic to English studies; and the conduct of the enterprise proceeds, consciously or unconsciously, through three distinctive but not separable operations: the descriptive, the interpretive, and the evaluative -- i.e. the responsibility of the critic moves from the question of defining a work of

literature -- the determination of text; to the problem of explaining its structure/meaning in terms of history and genre; to the judgment of value in itself and in relationship -- i.e. description, interpretation, evaluation. Although such prominent critics as Wellek and Frye would disagree on this contention, with Wellek advocating the triadic obligation and Frye arguing only for the first two, i.e. "the critic's primary task is to understand and explain."¹¹ This latter position seems to me to avoid bringing to bear on the various writers and their works "the three critical acts: discovering what a work of art is, how and how well it becomes what it is, and how worthwhile is what it is."¹²

By casting a cold eye of retrospect over the literary works produced by the numerous schools and movements of creative writers in this century, an obvious inference can be made as to the diversity of our contemporary literature. This phenomenon of diversity has likewise resulted in a corresponding profusion of critical responses to that literature. Whereas in the nineteenth century literary criticism was mainly either impressionistic appreciation or historical explanation or the realistic comparison of literature and life, in the twentieth century the field of literary criticism has become a "battleground on which myriad and mutually incompatible schools of criticism engage in struggle."¹³ The numerous anthologies of criticism, glossaries of critical terminology, and introductions to critical techniques attest to this enlarged role of criticism. Such titles as A Grammar of Literary Criticism, The Modern Critical Spectrum, Perspectives in Contemporary Criticism, A Handbook of Critical Approaches, et al. complicate the task of comprehending recent literary criticism because they exhibit all too clearly the multifarious ways to organize the history, theory, and practice of that

criticism. A cursory glance at some of the schemata of these works would reveal such arrangements as these:

1. The Use of Tradition
The Use of Formal Analysis
The Use of the Socio-Cultural Milieu
The Use of Biography
The Use of Humanism
The Use of Scholarship
The Use of Psychology
The Use of Myth 14
2. Classicism
Romanticism
Realism
Naturalism
Surrealism
Symbolism, Allegory and Myth¹⁵
3. Impressionistic Criticism
The New Humanism
Psychological Criticism
Sociological and Marxist Criticism
The New Criticism 16
4. The Historical Critic
The Formalist Critic
The Sociocultural Critic
The Psychological Critic
Mythopoeic Critic 17
5. Sensitivity Criticism
Doctrinaire Criticism
Historicist Criticism
Formalist Criticism 18
6. Marxist
Psychoanalytic
Linguistic and Stylistic
Organistic Formalism
Myth
Philosophical 19

Whichever scheme is adopted for surveying the main trends, a principal section of the critical landscape which continually comes into view is "formalism." Beginning in the late 1920's as a reaction against the excesses and weaknesses

of appreciative, biographical, historical, social, and moralistic criticism, "formalism" developed in the 1930's, became dominant in the 1940's and 50's, and is now in decline though not yet wholly in disfavor. While "formalism" has been "the most influential and vigorous critical movement of the twentieth century in both England and the United States,"²⁰ the thesis of this paper is that the era in which "formalism" predominated as a critical movement has now ended; in fact the death knell was sounded some two decades ago, although the influence of the school has been pervasive and elements of its methodology remain viable. These assertions, however, demand some further comment.

It is obvious to teachers of literature that "formalism" is not the only term to describe this movement; others are "new criticism," "organistic formalism," etc. What is not always so obvious is that the movement did not embody a single unified theory and methodology, though it came closer to doing so here in the United States than perhaps in any other country; it was instead an amalgam of related ideas and methods some of which were not always consistent with each other in theory and/or in practice. Nevertheless, the various practitioners did share one common and basic principle, that is, "the primacy of the literary work itself;" and this procedure resulted in the formulation of a theory and practice possessing a special vocabulary (irony, symbol, image, paradox, tension, ambiguity, texture, et al.), and emphasizing the close textual analysis of a work (with special stress on language, the inherent structural unity of a work, and the intricate part-whole analysis of a work.) The single most forceful expression of this credo and its articles of faith is an essay entitled "The Formalist Critic," by Cleanth Brooks, Kenyon Review (1951). While the original proponents preached the gospel of "the work

itself" but practiced a criticism in essays that roamed far and wide both within and outside of the work, their disciples began to solidify and rigidify the gospel into an orthodoxy which carried the day temporarily but was doomed to an inevitable demise because of certain limitations. Of these I would mention three in particular.

- (a) The tendency to regard a specific work as an objective ontological or metaphysical entity or structure with its own totally identifiable and separate existence.

This substitution of an exclusive ontological position for the work downgraded and tended to deny the facts of literary tradition and literary history as integral facets of our human experience.

- (b) The inclination to view the work itself as containing all of the information and data needed for describing, interpreting and evaluating the work rather than referring to external information and extra-literary values.

This presupposes a completed text which is itself a matter for criticism to decide; but even more vital is the comment of Jacques Barzun: "The pretense of remaining inside the work is an illusion . . . Either a work stands by itself, intelligible and potent, and then it needs no explaining, or else it requires explicating, and then something is brought to it from outside, were it only the beholder's experience of life and residue of education."²¹

- (c) The disposition to believe that the work is a closed system of meanings, a total and complete context, whose language

points only inward. The most trenchant rebuttal of this claim came from Leslie Fiedler who pointed out that: "The 'pure' literary critic, who pretends in the cant phrase, to stay 'inside' a work all of whose metaphors and meanings are pressing outward, is only half-aware. And half-aware, he deceives; for he cannot help smuggling unexamined moral and metaphysical judgments into his 'close analyses,' any more than the 'pure' literary historian can help bootlegging unconfessed aesthetic estimates into his chronicles. Literary criticism is always becoming 'something else,' for the simple reason that literature is always 'something else'."²²

There are other limitations, too, of formalism but these are sufficiently vivid to indicate some of the reasons for its now having reached as a critical movement what Wellek calls "a point of exhaustion."²³ If, then, the prevalence of formalism has terminated, what critical approaches or perspectives or postures are presently operative and seem to hold some potential of continuation for the immediate future?

In answering that question I would cite the perspectives in two categories: minor and major. The minor group consists of impressionistic, journalistic, and biographical criticism.

The impressionistic approach may be deplorable on the grounds that it does not analyse the work by bringing to it a unified theory and method but rather reflects the judgment of a work by the impression produced in the critic. However, it has the appeal of conveying or communicating a sense of personal appreciation; and in an era of increasing impersonality, the impressionist critic can serve to broaden public interest in literature whatever the specific merits of a particular work. Likewise, there is no reason to

believe, in my opinion, that the role of the intellectual journalistic critic will or should decline. We can think of such names as Edmund Wilson, Alfred Kazin, Granville Hicks, Norman Mailer; all of these men view the work of literature as embodying and performing an essential human function that is both personal and societal. While some of us in the academic establishment (i.e. professional organizations and educational institutions) sometimes become piqued by the acidity of their comment or the eccentricity of their judgment, it would be enervating to our own critical tasks if we should ignore either the comment or the judgment (e.g. note the recent MLA publication, Professional Standards and American Editions, "a pamphlet published to correct the misapprehensions engendered by Edmund Wilson's 'The Fruits of the MLA'."). Similarly, the biographical posture seems also well entrenched, for it performs a useful and meaningful service. I am well aware of the potential danger of biographical criticism -- i.e. evaluation of the author in place of his work -- but I also know its advantages as evidenced in the careful and deliberate hands of Carlos Baker, Leon Edel, and others. Furthermore, a quick glance at college and university catalogs reveals immediately that the most neglected genre in the teaching of literature is biography; yet the trade journals show continually that it is probably the most popular form of literature read in our society.

In the major category of critical perspectives, I mention the following as evincing a high degree of vitality and relevance that would seem to indicate their presence among us for a while longer: (1) mythological and/or archetypal, (2) linguistic and stylistic, (3) socio-cultural, (4) religious and/or theological, and (5) philosophical.

These critical postures share two common features. First, they are aware of what Murray Krieger designates as the problematic relation between "the unique existential context of cultural forces" and "the unique poetic context of the literary work," and therefore, they consider seriously the "extent to which and the ways in which the latter may be said to reflect the former."²⁴ Second, these critical perspectives endeavor to overcome the isolation, fragmentation and arbitrary selection of "formalism" by an awareness of the fact that the specific work of literature incarnates a "value structure" because it is a product of an artist's search for human vision.

(1) Grounded in anthropology and depth psychology, the mythological/archetypal movement in criticism has attempted to synthesize the data of those fields with a theory of art that would furnish for literary criticism a central principle by which to see "the total coherence of literature" or the underlying unity and integration of all literature in terms of a "monomyth" or "urmyth" from which all are derived. This perspective is very tantalizing as set forth by Northrup Frye, for it emphasizes that "total literary history moves from the primitive to the sophisticated, and here we glimpse the possibility of seeing literature as a complication of a relatively restricted and simple group of formulas that can be studied in primitive culture . . . If so, then the search for archetypes is a kind of literary anthropology concerned with the way that literature is informed by pre-literary categories such as ritual, myth, and folktale."²⁵ This effort is not without its pitfalls, nevertheless, and I point out two of them. One, there is no unanimity among the critics on what myth/archetype is or how it functions. Two, in its stringent

desire to find myth in literary works, the movement claims to be descriptive and interpretive and not evaluative; in fact Frye explicitly denies that evaluation is even possible. That myth criticism is highly evaluative, however, is evidenced by the works which are chosen to exhibit myth.

(2) The critical enterprise associated with linguistics and stylistics seems to be one of the most fluid, and consequently, one of the most difficult to describe. In general I think its basic orientation can be depicted by referring to its stress on literature as language, a medium of communication having its own intrinsic properties which imposes limitations on the artist; since language is not "natural" but social and arbitrary, literature cannot be analyzed apart from its historical and social matrix. Within that context a specific work may theoretically have a so-called objective meaning which, nevertheless, cannot be entirely shown; this meaning can, however, be distinguished from the new thought elicited in the reader by the experience of engaging the work.²⁶ This approach, thus, enables the critic by linguistic analysis of individual works to formulate stylistic generalities about specific writers and their eras [see, for example, Richard Ohmann, "Methods in the Study of Victorian Style," Victorian Newsletter, XXVII (Spring, 1965) 1-4; and Mills F. Edgerton, Jr., "A Linguistic Definition of Literature," Foreign Language Annals, I (December, 1967) 119-130.] This area of criticism will receive, in my opinion, more attention in the next few years as younger scholar-critics with a thorough knowledge of modern linguistic theory begin to grow weary of the increasing fragmentation of the linguistic field of inquiry and turn for respite to the consolation of meaning offered by the work of literature as art.

(3) Between 1930 and 1940, the socio-cultural approach to literature flourished in this country as numerous critics looked to the arts as a means

of social reform and a reflection of the movement of social history. The interpretation and evaluation of literature in its social, political and economic aspects were fairly widespread. But dialectical materialism's failure to furnish a comprehensive and integrative world-view, the effects of world warfare, and the continuous crises of democracy caused a subsiding of interest in the approach; the failure to find meaning in the socio-cultural milieu led to an effort to find meaning in the work itself, where permanence was to be found -- ipso facto, the development of formalism. Recently, however, there is a perceptible shift again to the view that the work of literature is a complex cultural phenomenon that cannot be understood apart from the socio-politico-economic milieu that produced it; and that the ideas present in a work are more important than its technique, for no great or enduring work has ever been created on the basis of a trivial and shallow ideology. Under the influence of the protest movement of the 1960's, the insistence of a new generation of students for relevance, the continued essays of men like Leslie Fiedler, Philip Rhav, Lionel Trilling, et al., and the rise of the New University Conference, a renaissance of interest in the role of literature as a social-cultural force is taking place. The code word is "relevance." The movement is not as ideologically doctrinaire as the Marxist perspective of the thirties, but it is no less insistent on the fact that literature is related to human life; and hence, literature, and all other art must be viewed in terms of its effect upon its age and in relationship to the cultural traits, the historical events, and the societal currents and crises of the time. The current diversity and ferment of sources and the lack of an orthodox ideology would seem to indicate a promising field of discussion for several years. The present rise of a literature treating the problems of

ethnic minorities and a literature of revolution will assure continued fermentation.

(4) The religious/theological perspective in criticism is relatively new, having acquired practitioners rapidly in the past fifteen years. Within this group are such diverse proponents as Nathan Scott, Jr.; Amos Wilder; Gabriel Vahanian; William Lynch; Jacques Maritain; Stanley Hopper, et al.; and their dissimilar views include, respectively, such titles as Modern Literature and the Religious Frontier (1958); Theology and Modern Literature (1958); The Death of God: The Culture of a Post-Christian Age (1961); Christ and Apollo: The Dimensions of the Literary Imagination (1960); The Responsibility of the Artist (1960); Spiritual Problems of Contemporary Literature (1958), and countless others. Underlying their many disparities are some common points of concern: the degree to which Western religions are this-worldly, taking seriously the "gritty historicity" of faith commitments; the new meaning of the breakdown between sacred and secular, holy and profane, and the inadequacy of those terms to deal with the concepts of God, the world, and man; the idea that the man of letters creates a work which incorporates to some extent the religious beliefs, values, and concerns of the culture; the significance attached to the concept of the creative artist as performing a prophetic role in society -- telling forth and revealing in his work what cannot be easily appropriated in any other way; the extent to which literature expresses that we contemporary men live in a post-Christian period of history characterized by waiting and tentativeness, but having vestiges of Judaic-Christian values and beliefs. This necessary brevity does not do justice to the ferment and fertility of the religious posture, and its adherents. It promises to be a stimulating enterprise in attempting to discover if and how

the area of faith commitment and the area of literary art converge, and if and how belief and literature are interrelated, and if and how hope and redemption for man are intrinsic to the artistic mode of experience.

(5) The philosophical perspective appears the most difficult of all to describe. In part that is due to the fact that existentialism as a philosophical force and movement has permeated the zeit geist thereby manifesting its presence in all of our modes of experience and our fields of thought. Literary criticism is no exception. On this subject I would refer you to Murray Krieger's The Tragic Vision (1960) and Geoffrey Hartman's The Unmeditated Vision (1954). The area of philosophic thought which probably will receive greater attention in relation to literary theory and the critical act is phenomenology. The single book which seems to be a charting of the way is that by Kurt Muller-Vollmer, Towards a Phenomenological Theory of Literature: A Study of Wilhelm Dilthey's 'Poetik' (1963). This work sets forth one man's theory designed to illuminate the totality of the literary phenomenon. That theory could become a paradigm providing "a basis for the critic to evaluate, criticize, and to synthesize a good many of the approaches to literature practiced and advocated today."²⁷

Conclusion

In terminating this cursory treatment of the present status of literary criticism, let me posit these conclusions.

(1) Perhaps, the most cogent inference that is discernible consists in the fact that there is presently no pre-dominant movement of criticism in the United States which can claim the allegiance of a large segment of intellectuals. Rather there exists a variety of critical approaches (most of which profess an

inherent tentativeness) practiced by a host of individuals engaged in unceasing philosophizing and theorizing. (I might add, too, there are those who have presupposed a theory but are unaware of it.)

(2) While the spectrum of critical perspectives is broad, the really distinctive feature of each approach is its emphasis. Since several critical responses may develop from the same work of literature, it is possible to put the emphasis in any of several places; whichever place is chosen, we must realize that "it is not the only place the emphasis can be put."²⁸

(3) To say that literary criticism must be theoretical and systematic in conception and practice is not to say that criticism is in any sense final.

No work of criticism is final. Criticism is never done once and for all. It is always contingent on the historical process and the state of social evolution. With every change of historical phase the literature of the past requires to be re-interpreted, and critical questions are never closed because the existing literary canon is not a closed series. New works are continually being added, and our interpretation of the new alters our interpretation of the old.²⁹

(4) No correct procedure for criticizing a work of literature exists; there is no example of perfect criticism; every perspective or approach has both merits and limitations. "To see criticism in its literary character is to realize that an exclusively valid method of work can no more be prescribed in its field than in poetry or the drama."³⁰

(5) Criticism has gained increasing recognition in some quarters but a crucial question remains as to the extent to which it has become an integral segment of the English curriculum. On that point I agree with Professor Murray Krieger that we have neglected far too long the incorporation in our curricula of a program designed to foster "an awareness of the relation of systematic thinking about criticism to the practice of criticism and to actual

literary works."³¹ We must keep before us two essential questions: "What criticism should we ourselves read, study, or practice, and what criticism . . . should we teach to our students?"³²

If we need an authority to which to appeal for motivation in this matter of the theory, history and practice of criticism, we could do no better than to listen to this statement by Henry James: "I am damned critical -- for it's the only thing to be, and all else is damned humbug."

Fred L. Standley

Footnotes

1. Michael F. Shugrue, English in a Decade of Change (New York, 1968), pp. iv-viii.
2. Ibid.
3. Rene Wellek, Concepts of Criticism (New Haven, 1963), p. 344.
4. Murray Krieger, The Play and Place of Criticism (Baltimore, 1967), p. 131.
5. Iredell Jenkins, Art and the Human Enterprise (Cambridge, Mass., 1958), p. 123.
6. Stanley Edgar Hyman, The Armed Vision (New York, 1955), p. 8.
7. "Religion and the Responsibility of the Artist," in Stanley Romaine Hopper, ed., Spiritual Problems in Contemporary Life (New York, 1952), pp. 176-177.
8. Graham Hough, An Essay on Criticism (New York, 1966), pp. 4-5.
9. Ibid., pp. 5-6.
10. R. P. Blackmur, "A Critic's Job of Work," Form and Values in Modern Poetry (New York, 1946) and "A Burden for Critics," Hudson Review, I (1948), 170-185; Leslie Fiedler, "Toward an Amateur Criticism," The Kenyon Review, XII (Autumn, 1950), 561-574; Allen Tate, The Man of Letters in the Modern World (New York, 1955); Yvor Winters, "Problems for the Modern Critic of Literature," Hudson Review, IX (1956), 325-386; Philip Rahv, Literature and the Sixth Sense (New York, 1969).
11. Northrup Frye, "Literary Criticism," in James Thorpe, ed., The Aims and Methods of Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures (New York, 1963), pp. 59-60.
12. Lawrence S. Hall, A Grammar of Criticism (New York, 1965), p. v.
13. Donald Heiney, Contemporary Literature (Great Neck, New York, 1954), pp. 485-486.
14. Gerald and Nancy Goldberg, eds., The Modern Critical Perspective (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1962).
15. Hall.
16. Heiney.
17. Sheldon N. Grebstein, ed., Perspectives in Contemporary Criticism (New York, 1968).
18. This outline was suggested in a work sheet prepared by Professor Jerome Taylor, University of Chicago.

Fred L. Standley

19. Wellek.
20. Grebstein, p. 75.
21. Quoted in Grebstein, p. 84.
22. Fiedler, "Towards an Amateur Criticism," p. 564.
23. Wellek, p. 359.
24. Krieger, The Play and Place of Criticism, pp. 239 f.
25. Grebstein, pp. 317-319.
26. Mills F. Edgerton, Jr., "A Linguistic Definition of Literature," Foreign Language Annals, I (December, 1967), 119-130.
27. Kurt Muller-Vollmer, Towards a Phenomenological Theory of Literature (The Hague, 1963), pp. 10-11.
28. William Van O'Connor, "Introduction," in Goldberg, p. XVII.
29. Hough, p. 8.
30. Rahv, p. 252.
31. Krieger, pp. 140-141.
32. Wayne C. Booth, "The Use of Criticism in the Teaching of Literature," College English, XXVII (October, 1965), pp. 4-5.